

Comments on the proposed conservation of usage of the names *Mystacina* Gray, 1843, *Chalinolobus* Peters, 1866, *M. tuberculata* Gray, 1843 and *C. tuberculatus* (J.R. Forster, 1844) (Mammalia, Chiroptera)
(Case 3095; see BZN 56: 250–254)

(1) Martyn Kennedy

Division of Environmental and Evolutionary Biology, Institute of Biomedical and Life Sciences, University of Glasgow, Glasgow G12 8QQ, U.K.

I support Spencer & Lee's application for the conservation of name usage for the New Zealand bats *Mystacina tuberculata* Gray, 1843 and *Chalinolobus tuberculatus* (J.R. Forster, 1844); their argument is compelling. These names have been universally accepted for a century or more (in addition to references cited in the application see Miller (1907), Pierson et al. (1986), Koopman (1994), Hand et al. (1998) and Kennedy et al. (1999)). The name *M. velutina* Hutton, 1872 has been used instead of *M. tuberculata* only by Thomas (1905; as *Mystacops velutinus*) and by Mayer et al. (1999), in both cases on the mistaken grounds described in the application. Because New Zealand has only two known extant bat species they are commonly known by their vernacular and generic names, and the similarity of their specific names has not in fact caused confusion. The stable usage of *Mystacina tuberculata* should continue.

Additional references

- Hand, S.J., Murray, P., Megirian, D., Archer, M. & Godthelp, H. 1998. Mystacinid bats (Microchiroptera) from the Australian Tertiary. *Journal of Paleontology*, **72**: 538–545.
Kennedy, M., Paterson, A.M., Morales, J.C., Parsons, S., Winnington, A.P. & Spencer, H.G. 1999. The long and short of it: Branch lengths and the problem of placing the New Zealand short-tailed bat, *Mystacina*. *Molecular Phylogenetics and Evolution*, **13**: 405–416.
Koopman, K.F. 1994. Chiroptera: Systematics. *Handbook of Zoology*, vol. 8, pt. 60.
Miller, G.S. 1907. The families and genera of bats. *Bulletin of the United States National Museum*, no. 57. 282 pp.
Pierson, E.D., Sarich, V.M., Lowenstein, J.M., Daniel, M.J. & Rainey, W.E. 1986. A molecular link between the bats of New Zealand and South America. *Nature*, **323**: 60–63.

(2) Kerry-Jayne Wilson

Ecology and Entomology Group, P.O. Box 84, Lincoln University, Canterbury, New Zealand

I lecture in vertebrate ecology at Lincoln University and have had three graduate students do theses on New Zealand bats. I have frequent contact with government agencies and, by means of broadcasts and written articles, with the lay public on matters concerning the ecology and conservation of New Zealand's native biota, including the bat species. I know of nobody who finds the existing scientific names of the bats confusing, and I urge their retention.

(3) Trevor Worthy

Palaeofaunal Surveys, 43 The Ridgeway, Nelson, New Zealand

I would like to go on record as supporting the well-founded arguments and proposals of Spencer & Lee. There is no doubt as to what taxa the names *Mystacina*

tuberculata and *Chalinolobus tuberculatus* refer to, and to change either of them would create confusion.

(4) Adrian Paterson

Ecology and Entomology Group, P.O. Box 84, Lincoln University, Canterbury, New Zealand

I use the name *Mystacina tuberculata* Gray, 1843 frequently, in teaching, research and publications. This bat is subject to a great deal of research in New Zealand due to its uniqueness and high conservation needs, and its scientific name is in constant usage. I strongly support the application.

(5) Peter D. Dwyer

Anthropology Program, Department of Geography and Environmental Studies, University of Melbourne, Victoria, Australia 3010

I agree with the proposals to preserve the universal usage of the names *Mystacina tuberculata* Gray, 1843 and *Chalinolobus tuberculatus* (J.R. Forster, 1844). Spencer & Lee's discussion and recommendations reach beyond, but concur with, my own conclusions (Dwyer, 1960, pp. 10–12; 1962, pp. 2–3). Hutton's (1872) specific name *velutina* was an unnecessary replacement name for Gray's *Mystacina tuberculata*, and apart from Thomas (1905) and Mayer et al. (1999) has been used by nobody. I support Spencer & Lee's application in the interests of nomenclatural stability.

Additional references

- Dwyer, P.D. 1960. *Studies on New Zealand Chiroptera*. Unpublished M.Sc. thesis, Victoria University of Wellington, New Zealand.
 Dwyer, P.D. 1962. Studies on the two New Zealand bats. *Zoology Publications from Victoria University of Wellington*, 28: 1–28.

Comments on the proposed conservation of *Holochilus* Brandt, 1835, *Proechimys* J.A. Allen, 1899 and *Trinomys* Thomas, 1921 (Mammalia, Rodentia) by the designation of *H. sciureus* Wagner, 1842 as the type species of *Holochilus* (Case 3121; see BZN 56: 255–261)

(1) Ulyses F.J. Pardiñas

Departamento Científico Paleontología Vertebrados, Museo de La Plata, Paseo del Bosque s/n, 1900 La Plata, Argentina

After a careful study of the application I completely agree with the proposal to conserve the names *Holochilus* Brandt, 1835, *Proechimys* J.A. Allen, 1899 and *Trinomys* Thomas, 1921 for three genera of Neotropical rodents.

My concerns lie with *Holochilus* as I have worked with sigmodontines, particularly fossils but extant as well, for the last 10 years. This genus has a rich fossil record in southern South America, ranging from Middle Pleistocene to Holocene (see Pardiñas, 1999). The first citations (as *Holochilus multannus* Ameghino, 1889 and